

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 21, 2007 patentability of claims 1-14 and 16-19 was addressed. Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 7, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14, 16-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Agrawal et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,832,475, in view of *Chaudhuri et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,842,753, and in view of *Soderstrom et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,741,982. Claims 5-6, 12-13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Agrawal et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,832,475, in view of *Chaudhuri et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,842,753, in view of *Soderstrom et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,741,982, and in view of *Dageville et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0065688.

I. Examiner's Interview

In response to the Examiner's Interview Summary dated May 31, 2007, Applicants' Attorney hereby submits a summary of the interview.

On May 31, 2007, Applicants' Attorney and Examiner Pannala met for an in-person interview at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. There was no exhibit or demonstration of the invention provided. The claims discussed during the interview included outstanding claims 1-19. The prior art references, U.S. Patent No. 5,832,475 to *Agrawal et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,842,753 to *Chouduri*, U.S. Patent No. 6,741,982 to *Soderstrom et al.*, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0065688 to *Dageville*, were discussed as they apply to the prior art rejections of the outstanding claims.

This interview took place following issuance of a Final Office Action. Prior to the interview, Applicants' Attorney provided Examiner Pannala with a proposed amendment to the claims to further define the invention over the prior art of record. It was discussed how the proposed amendment overcomes the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§112, first paragraph, 112, second paragraph, and 101. It was further discussed how the proposed amendment should also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as the prior art of record does not teach the mathematical relationship as claimed by Applicants. Although, it was

agreed that the proposal presented should overcome the prior art of record, a formal response would necessitate a search update by the Examiner.

II. Conclusion

Applicants have submitted herewith an amendment to the claims that conform with the proposal presented to and discussed with the Examiner during the interview of May 31, 2007. In view of the forgoing amendment to the claims, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the application are now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims in their prior forms are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that she be contacted at the number indicated below.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now presented are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn and this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Rochelle Lieberman/

Rochelle Lieberman
Registration No. 39,276
Attorney for Applicants

Lieberman & Brandsdorfer, LLC
802 Still Creek Lane
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Phone: (301) 948-7775
Fax: (301) 948-7774
Email: rocky@legalplanner.com
Date: June 15, 2007